



**COPY MAILED**

**JUL 13 2005**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION, S.C.  
POST OFFICE BOX 26618  
MILWAUKEE WI 53226

In re Application of  
Alan L. Kaganov et al.  
Application No. 10/808,216  
Filed: March 24, 2004  
Attorney Docket No. 9494.18

:  
: DECISION ON PETITIONS  
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) AND  
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)  
:

This is a decision on the renewed petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6), filed June 15, 2005, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) for the benefit of the prior-filed applications set forth in the concurrently filed amendment.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

A petition under 37 CFR 1.78 was filed November 15, 2004 and dismissed in a decision mailed June 1, 2005 because the amendment submitted with the petition was unacceptable and, therefore, could not be considered a proper reference under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i). More specifically, the amendment was physically a part of the petition and, as such, did not comply with 37 CFR 1.121, 1.52, or 1.4(c). 37 CFR 1.121 states that amendments are made by filing a paper, in compliance with § 1.52, directing that specified amendments be made. The pertinent section of 37 CFR 1.52 states that the claim (in this case, the claim for priority), must commence on a separate physical sheet. 37 CFR 1.4(c) states that each distinct subject must be contained in a separate paper since different matters may be considered by different branches of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Additionally, the petition filed November 15, 2004 was treated under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) but should have also been treated under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3).

Comes now petitioner with the instant renewed petition and amendment.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) and 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(i) and 1.78(a)(5)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The instant nonprovisional application was filed after November 29, 2000, and the claim herein for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed applications is submitted after

expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). Therefore, this is a proper petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6).

The instant nonprovisional application was pending at the time of filing of the reference to the prior-filed provisional application as required by 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(ii). Additionally, the intermediate non-provisional application, Application No. 10/271,334, was filed within twelve months of the filing date of the prior-filed provisional application, Application No. 60/333,937, which was filed on November 28, 2001.

The petition complies with the requirements for a grantable petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) in that (1) a reference to the prior-filed applications has been included in an amendment to the first sentence of the specification following the title, as provided by 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(iii) and 1.78(a)(5)(iii); (2) the surcharge fee required by 37 CFR 1.17(t) has been submitted; and (3) the petition contains an adequate statement of unintentional delay. Accordingly, having found that the instant petition for acceptance of an unintentionally delayed claim for the benefit of priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) to the prior-filed applications satisfies the conditions of 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6), the petition is granted.

***The granting of the petition to accept the delayed benefit claim to the prior-filed applications under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) should not be construed as meaning that the instant application is entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the prior-filed applications. In order for the instant application to be entitled to the benefit of the prior-filed applications, all other requirements under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 1.78(a)(1) and (a)(2) and under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(4) and (a)(5) must be met. Similarly, the fact that the corrected Filing Receipt accompanying this decision on petition includes the prior-filed applications should not be construed as meaning that applicant is entitled to the claim for benefit of priority to the prior-filed applications noted thereon. Accordingly, the examiner will, in due course, consider this benefit claim and determine whether the instant application is entitled to the benefit of the earlier filing date.***

A corrected Filing Receipt, which includes the priority claim to the prior-filed applications, accompanies this decision on petition.

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Senior Petitions Attorney Patricia Faison-Ball at (571) 272-3212. All other inquiries concerning either the examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

The application is being forwarded to Technology Center AU 3731 for appropriate action on the amendment submitted June 15, 2005, including consideration by the examiner of the claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 119(e) for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed applications.



Frances Hicks  
Lead Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy

**ATTACHMENT** : Corrected Filing Receipt